

In fact, the compensation czar today announced some compensation rules which were kind of interesting, and I think there's going to be some contract law matters that will probably come up on that. But we have a compensation czar. We have a czar probably, you know, furniture polish czar, for all I know. But sunset the czars. In other words, let's look at them, see what they're doing. If they're not doing anything worth having or they're duplicating efforts that are done by the people who've gone through the Senate appointment process and been vetted by the Senate, the secretaries of the various departments of this government, maybe we ought to just eliminate the czars.

Then our friend, MARSHA BLACKBURN, has a bill that the President is to report the responsibilities and qualifications that authorize the special assistance of czars. The President will certify that the czars will not assert powers beyond those granted by the law to a commissioned officer on the President's staff, and Congress will hold hearings on the President's report and certification within 30 days.

In other words, Mr. President, tell us what those folks are going to do, how qualified they are to do the job. We're going to pay them somewhere between \$175,000 and \$200,000 a year to do the job. And the Congress ought to be able to see that report and have the ability to deal with it. Both of these are good laws, and both of these have to do with czars. My friend, LOUIE GOHMERT, has been here with me for almost the full hour. We're about 5 minutes from conclusion, so I'll yield a couple of minutes to my friend, LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. With regard to the czars, we've seen over and over examples of people who have been placed in these positions, and it doesn't do me any good or anybody in America any good to say, well, you know, prior presidents have used czars. Not to this extent. Not ever, and I never really cared for them, no matter who the President was. I didn't like the bailout last year. I thought, until this administration, it was possibly the worst domestic action that's been taken in the last 50 or 60 years. That is, until this administration just left \$700 billion in the sand as it blew through more and more money. But then, to have this massive spending spree that's, while we've got people appointed by the White House, not properly vetted, and the more we find out about these people, the more we're concerned they should never have been in those positions in the first place.

And as we know, we've already had one recently step down, he should have never been there in the first place, whereas, if you went through regular order there and had advice and consent of the Senate, it doesn't mean they're going to be perfect. Nobody is. No process is. But there was real ingenuity in the process that was set up by the Founders, and the advice and consent

is an important issue. But the whole reason our Founders set up a President outside the main stream of Congress, unlike the parliament that elects a prime minister from this body, it was going to be from outside this body so that there would be more checks and balances, and the czars have done nothing but create Scars upon Thars—with all deference to Dr. Seuss—scars across America, as they have been unaccountable to the Congress, to the courts, to America. And that really has to be changed.

□ 2200

We need the sunlight. We need transparency. We don't need czars.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I agree with my friend and fellow judge from Texas. We don't need czars that don't answer to the people. We intentionally designed the executive department to stand with checks and balances over it, just like the legislative department is designed that way. We intended it. This is not the way our Founding Fathers intended this country to be run.

We've been talking tonight about the rule of law. It's about the rule of law. It's about following the rules. You know, if we don't hold each other to the standards that are required by this body, if we don't hold our colleagues to the standards that are required by this body, then why would we expect the American people to trust us? I will tell you, all of us need to be worried about the issue of trust. So I will continue to raise these issues, and I will be glad to be joined by anyone in this discussion to discuss following the rules and obeying the law.

MODIFICATION IN APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NYE). Without objection and pursuant to clause 11 of rule I, the Chair removes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) as a conferee from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on H.R. 2647 and appoints the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

REPEAL THE DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight, October 6, at 10:03 p.m., we have a very special night. My colleagues and I stand here tonight to champion the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell is important. It's important for three reasons.

Number one, it is vital to our national security that we repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell. We have kicked out over 13,000 troops since we enacted this law 16 years ago. We have kicked out over 400 troops just this year, in 2009. When our commanders on the ground are desperate for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, now is not the time to throw them out—not for any type of sexual misconduct, but just because they're gay.

Number two, do we need to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell because it is doing right by our taxpayers? It is costing the American taxpayer \$1.3 billion to throw these young American heroes out of our military just because of their sexual orientation. It costs the American taxpayer \$60,000 to recruit these young heroes to come in, to train them up, to make them warriors, and then we just disregard them just because of their sexual orientation.

And, lastly, the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy goes against the very fabric of what makes our country the greatest country on Earth, the fact that we're all created equal.

Mr. Speaker, we have colleagues, Members of this great House here tonight to argue about the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. There are 176 cosponsors to repeal this act, but one of these Members is the highest-ranking enlisted soldier ever to serve the United States Congress. He was a command sergeant major. That is the highest rank you can become in the United States Army in the enlisted ranks. He is a sophomore Congressman from Minnesota. His name is TIM WALZ. He is an American patriot and a hero, and I'd like to turn it over to my colleague and my friend, TIM WALZ from the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ. Thank you to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Thank you for your service in the military. Thank you for your leadership in this Congress and, especially, thank you for standing forward on this important issue. The colleagues who have joined us here tonight understand this issue is one of civil liberties, of basic human dignity and of national security.

As my colleague said, I had the privilege and the honor to serve this Nation for 24 years in uniform. I can tell you, there is no greater privilege than putting on the uniform of the United States Army and trying to do the best